

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE CASE OF

THE KING

VERSUS

BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS.

CONSIDERATIONS.

ON THE CASE OF

LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR

THE KING

VERSUS

BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

By W. H. B. in the Year 1791.

1791.

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE CASE OF

THE KING

OF GREAT BRITAIN

BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE CASE OF

LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR

THE KING

OF GREAT BRITAIN

BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS



**CONSIDERATIONS**  
**ON THE CASE OF**  
**THE KING**  
**VERSUS**  
**BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS,**  
Being the Substance of a Pamphlet entitled  
**A DEFENCE**  
OF THE RIGHT REVEREND THE  
**LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR.**

---

BY THE  
**REV. RICE HUGHES, A. M.**  
DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE  
**EARL OF POULETT,**  
AND LATE OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

---

**LONDON:**  
PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,  
By W. WILSON, St. Peter's-Hill, Doctors'-Common.

---

**M.DCC.XCVI.**

CONSIDERATIONS

ON THE CASE OF

THE KING

VERSUS

BISHOP OF BANGOR AND OTHERS;

Being the Substance of a Tractate entitled

A DEFENCE

OF THE RIGHT REVEREND THE

LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR.

BY THE

REV. RICE HUGHES, A.M.

DOMESTIC CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE THE

EARL OF ROULETTE,

AND LATE OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

LONDON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR,

By W. Wilson, St. Peter's Hill, Doctors' Commons.

MDCCLXXV.



## CONSIDERATIONS, &c.

THE fate of the prosecutions against the Bishop of Bangor and his friends having been determined by a verdict, and the trial having been published in as authentic a form as can be expected; it may now be permitted to one, who has not been an inattentive observer of what has been passing in the county of Caernarvon, to offer the public some considerations on this extraordinary case. The writer feels, that he does not enter upon this task with that spirit which produced and circulated, most industriously, though clandestinely, a scandalous, virulent, and malignant libel on the Bishop, immediately before these charges were brought forward. That publication might have raised prejudices strong enough to have influenced the determination, and so have poisoned the very fountain, of justice. That it was intended to produce that effect, and that the pamphlet, and the indictments,

ments, were parts of the same measure, cannot be doubted. If the pamphlet failed in its purpose, it was because the folly, the malice, and the wickedness of it, were so thinly veiled, that all honest men saw through it, and treated it with the contempt which it so justly merited.

The present publication may assist the cause of truth and justice, but can mislead no one. The principal facts are established by the testimony of Mr. Grindley himself, or his own witnesses, on oath, or are so notorious that they cannot be contradicted. If any one man hath seen them through a medium which may be false, it becomes the duty of another, who conceives that he can place them in the true point of view, to make the attempt.

It may naturally enough be asked, what had the Bishop of Bangor done to provoke this attack upon him? How much he had done to endear himself to all ranks of people in his diocese, thousands can testify! What occasion could he have given for such a torrent of abuse being first poured upon him, and afterwards followed up by persecutions, which, from the nature of them, must be felt as the highest indignity which can be offered to a man in his station?



It is often difficult to press the matter of a bad heart to its true source. In an instance of the kind, I have met with a case of the following kind:—If we knew with absolute certainty who were the authors of the pamphlet, and who were the secret instigators of these prosecutions, it is probable that the question might receive a distinct answer; perhaps, the time is not far distant when this will be known—it is in train—these innocent diaries know that it is in train.—At this instant they anticipate the feelings which a consciousness of guilt detested creates; even now they are haunted in their dreams with persecutions; already the Bishop hath his revenge, if that passion could find its way to his breast. They made him feel, but he supported himself under his feelings, because he was innocent; these men feel and trust not, because they know that they are guilty.

In the mean time, I can only direct the attention of the reader to those causes of offence which the pamphlet and the indelicate suggestions did produce. I cannot do so, that, in the summer of the last year, the Bishop of Bangor signified to the Lord Viscount Bulkeley, that his brother, Sir Robert Williams, having had the misfortune to have a verdict passed against him, at the Worcester assizes, for criminal conversation with the wife of

a gentleman of that county, he (the Bishop) could  
 not recommend to the clergy of his Diocese to  
 give their support to Sir Robert as a Candidate  
 for the County of Caernarvon in the ensuing Par-  
 liament, and that he thought they ought to sup-  
 port Lord Powys, the other candidate. This,  
 whatever merit is to be attached to it, I believe  
 the Bishop has to answer for; beyond this, I be-  
 lieve, he had given no cause of offence to that  
 Noble Lord, or his connections; and surely, even  
 in these days, it was no reasonable cause of  
 quarrel with a Bishop, who took any care of his  
 Diocese, that he exhorted his clergy not to ex-  
 press, even at an election, an open contempt of  
 the moral law delivered by God himself to his  
 people:—"Thou shalt not commit adultery;"—  
 Nor had the Bishop given any new cause of  
 offence, as I ever heard, to another Noble Lord  
 (the Earl of Uxbridge) who warmly espoused the  
 cause of Sir R. Williams, and who, upon some  
 misunderstanding of an old date, had withdrawn  
 his countenance and favor from the Bishop; but  
 who, doubtless, is of too noble a nature to harbour,  
 and keep alive in his breast, for such a long time,  
 the eager resentment which burst into such  
 a flame in this pamphlet.

One of those misunderstandings between this  
 Noble Lord and his agents, and the Bishop of  
 Bangor,



Bangor, respected the rebuilding the parish church of Ambsch, where the famous Paris Mountain and its copper mines are situated. The church was in a ruinous state, and too small for the number of the inhabitants. The proprietors of these mines had brought into the parish a multitude of people, from whose labour they derived immense wealth. The Bishop was of opinion, that the proprietors of the mines should be at the expense of rebuilding the church; that they ought to do it, for the public who were doing so much for them. The Bishop understood that it had been promised to him, that it should be rebuilt at the expense of the proprietors. The Noble Earl and his agents insist that they undertook for no more than that they should contribute a certain sum towards the work. There was a mistake somewhere; the memory is fallible; liberality has its hot and its cold fits; thin need not have produced a quarrel; but they, into whose hands this pamphlet has fallen, will perceive, that it is made the subject of a quarrel with the Bishop, which, for purposes we may guess at, is revived, with extraordinary vehemence and violence, at this critical time.

The Noble Earl had also taken offence, most unaccountably, at the exertions of the Bishop to put the Grammar School at Bangor, upon a good footing, which he effected at a very great expense

to himself, and a large sacrifice of his own time—he having himself superintended the work from the beginning to the end. The Bishop is amply rewarded—he has the happiness to see the school flourish under a very able master whom he placed there; not without being under the necessity of making many arrangements; which, I should not wonder, if the authors of the pamphlet called *Sinister*, in order to make room for him, might have overlooked. When the Bishop came first to Bangor, there were four or five ragged boys in the school not very well taken care of; there are now eighty scholars of good connexions in the country carefully educated. The town of Bangor, and the adjacent country, feel the immediate effects of an increased circulation. But this is, comparatively, a small circumstance. Let us look forward to the benefit, the incalculable benefit of an improved civilization, which this excellent provision of the means for well educating the rising generation, in that part of the country, must produce.

Will it be believed that this is one of the grievances stated in this pamphlet? Fortunately, for the cause of truth, this chagitable work, entered upon, and executed with so much generosity and assiduity, and upon motives which could not be misunderstood by any man whose judgment



was not warped by strong and passionate prejudice;—this capital improvement of the Grammar School at Bangor is introduced, and made a subject for the most slanderous abuse in this pamphlet;—fortunately, I say, for the cause of truth—*ex pede Herculeus*—this enabled honest and fair men to take a just measure of the whole of that execrable performance.

With those exceptions which may be collected from this short history, and from this additional circumstance, that the Bishop judges for himself on whom he shall bestow those benefices of which he is the patron;—and here the writer takes upon himself to assert, that the Bishop has, in no one instance, conferred a parochial benefice on a clergyman who was not master of the Welsh Language; and that, in many instances, he has bestowed them on those who, for thirty years, had been the curates starving upon a miserable stipend; and who, having no *alien* interest, had no friend but the Bishop: With these exceptions, I apprehend, that the Bishop might reasonably conclude himself to be, and probably was, upon that footing with his clergy, and with his diocese, which his care and protection of his clergy, his hospitality, and his friendly offices to the country in general, entitled him to be.

In

In this state of things, very unexpectedly indeed it must have been to him, this libellous pamphlet appeared—this masked battery opened upon him—the guns all loaded to the very muzzle with language—falsehoods of all sorts stuffed into it, mixed with a very small proportion of distorted truths, just enough to give it some confidence, and to make people endure to read it.

The object was sufficiently apparent; but the Bishop was a man of too much constancy to be driven from his ground by this base and treacherous attack. (Some of the parties concerned will see) what I mean by the word treacherous.) Then followed this measure of a legal proceeding against the Bishop and his friends, in the form of indictments, preferred at the Grand Sessions held at Conway, and found by the Grand Jury, whose Foreman was *Sir Robert Williams* 1<sup>st</sup>. I will do the authors of this measure the justice to acknowledge, that this was a master-stroke; the wit of man, sharpened by the malice of the devil, could not have devised an engine more likely to distress the Bishop, and to bend him to their purposes; any public imputation upon his conduct, the possibility of his conduct being so misrepresented by false witnesses, or so misunderstood by a Judge and Jury, that he might have to appear in  
a Court



a Court of Justice as a convicted delinquent, as one who had entirely forgotten the duties of his station, and had violated the laws of his country, could not be reflected on without horror by the most constant men of that order and rank in the State:—The thought of it must have been almost insupportable. To be relieved from the anxiety which this state of accusation must produce, the very best of us would feel inclined to think worth purchasing upon almost any terms. This was, therefore, what was exultingly called a "*Grand operation*."

Some of the steps taken to secure the success of this *Grand operation* have transpired. Such secrets are generally ill kept,—they do no honour to the parties concerned. Some of those parties perceived that such steps would do them no honour; and, I verily believe, were unwillingly dragged into the participation of them. One of them in particular, [who, with all his faults, is a good-humoured man, and of great honour, I am confident would rather have gone an hundred miles another way, than have been seen at Conway on such an occasion—*But the serpent beguiled him, and he did eat.*

The face of things was now very much changed. The abuse of an anonymous writer might be despised

spoiled and overlooked. There was now a formal charge of high-misdemeanors against the Bishop, with a prosecutor to avow them; and ("tell it not in Gath, publish it not in Ashtalon") it had received the solemn sanction of the presentment of a grand inquest;—that branch of our criminal jurisdiction which hath hitherto been considered as the palladium of Englishmen; as that which was effectually to guard them against that worst of evils—the course of the law of the land prostituted to unworthy purposes.

Two indictments were preferred: the first against the Bishop alone, for an assault on one Roberts, a blacksmith, whom Mr. Grindley had thought proper to associate with him in the custody of the Registrar's Office. The second, against the Bishop, with four others, charging a Right Reverend Prelate, Bishop of the Diocese—a dignified Clergyman, the Archdeacon of Merioneth—two other very respectable Clergymen—and a Layman, a gentleman practising the law, who had succeeded Mr. Grindley as agent to the Bishop, with having been guilty of a riot; with having riotously assaulted Mr. Grindley, and with having instigated several persons, riotously assembled, to remove and expel Mr. Grindley, by force, from the Registrar's Office.

belong

Such



Such an assembly of rioters one might have expected to have found grouped in a licentious farce; but it was reserved for those who instigated Mr. Grindley to commence this prosecution, to introduce living characters of such a description into an indictment for such an offence.

These indictments having been found by the Grand Inquest for the county of Caernarvon, the Bishop had this alternative, either to shrink from all further inquiry, and make his peace with his enemies, on such terms as they should be *graciously* pleased to grant to him, or to meet the charges with firmness. He did not hesitate for a moment; he chose the latter, and put himself upon his country, to the no small mortification of his adversaries, who had flattered themselves they had taken their measures so well, that the Bishop would be driven to an unconditional submission.

Another cruel disappointment soon followed: The instigators of these prosecutions had made themselves quite sure, that the trial of the indictments must be had in the county of Caernarvon. Feeling in their own persons to what a pitch men could be worked up by an election spirit, it is not quite impossible but that they might derive hopes of success from that circumstance. They found themselves defeated, and had the additional mortifi-

lication to discover, that they had defected themselves. That their own practices—the circulation of that abominable pamphlet, had not only made it necessary, but had given the Bishop a right to remove the indictments, and to bring them on to trial in the next English county. They found that these causes would be to be tried by a Jury composed of men of the first rank in the county of Salop, men who were not dipped in the wretched politics of the Caernarvon election. All the pains they had taken to prejudice the county against the Bishop were now perceived to be thrown away. They could not cheat themselves into the fond hope that such men would imbibe narrow prejudices. There are, however, prejudices which generous minds might feel; and they began to apprehend that their labours might operate against themselves; for they could hardly hope that an indifferent Jury, men of honour, could consider the pamphlet, and their prosecutions coupled together, as any thing short of a foul conspiracy against the honour, I might add, against the life of the Bishop of Bangor. Indeed, no man could have been surprised, if he had sunk under the weight of so much venal persecution.

The history of the passages which were made the colour for the ridiculous charge of a riot, may be, in a great measure, collected from the trial which has been published.

Mr.



Mr. Grindley related them upon oath. Mr. Grindley was examined, and cross-examined. The Jury were immediately satisfied! They acquitted the defendants *with the entire approbation of the Bar, and with the hearty concurrence of a large and most respectable auditory.* This was a stunning defeat, not only to those who were immediately concerned in the Grand operation, but to a malignant party who had rejoiced in seeing men whom they hated, *abused as cordially as they do the Bishops*, doing their work for them, preparing the way for their own destruction, by degrading the Hierarchy in the person of one of the Bishops, and so undermining one of the pillars of the Constitution. In this respect, a victory would have been dearly bought by these short-sighted politicians who are too angry to be wile. Of this they had given sufficient proofs a short time before, when they did buy a victory at a price which some of their best friends have thought rather extravagant. Had but one ray of common sense illuminated the dark corners in North Wales, they might have avoided the disgrace, both of their victory, and of their defeat.

What now was to be done? This verdict threatened to put an end to the short but disastrous reign of that tyrannic election spirit, which can brook

no opposition to its *last* will, and would stop to any thing in order to gratify its rancor; something was to be thought of.

This only remained. Great pains have been taken to publish, that the learned Judge, who tried this cause, summed up the evidence favourably for the prosecution; and that he did not approve of this verdict. The publishers of this information to the public have the authority of the trial, as now printed, for the assertion; and I have no authority to deny that such was the summing-up of the learned Judge.

I have too profound a reverence for the Judges of England, and have too much personal respect for the learned Judge in particular, to treat his opinions lightly: But I claim the privilege of examining them decently and gravely, and of convicting them of error, if they shall be found to be erroneous. The importance, nay the absolute necessity of such an enquiry, is obvious. Those men, who have so industriously circulated the opinion of the learned Judge, know full well the influence it must have upon the public, and therefore they have circulated it. If the opinion is well founded, it will have (I agree it ought to have) its weight. If it is erroneous, it ought to be reversed, as far as, in the nature of the thing,

it



it can be reversed; and the Bishop ought to be restored to so much of the public opinion as he has lost by this error. I am informed that there is no course of law in which this error can be examined, and an authoritative reversal had of the judgment, if I may so call it, of the learned Judge. If it is suffered to pass current in the world, the mischief is irreparable. The promoters of these indictments, so countenanced, may presume to shew their heads again, and the benefit of such an example of malice, detected and defeated, may be in a manner lost. It is, therefore, a justice due to the Bishop and his friends, who have not the full benefit of their acquittal; it is due to the Jury, who lie under a sort of imputation, as if they had given a verdict against law, and against evidence; it is due to the community at large, who ought to enjoy the full protection which this verdict holds out to them against calumnious and malicious prosecutions; that what is now published as the opinion of the learned Judge should undergo an examination.

The principal object of this little tract is to enable those, to whom the opinion of the learned Judge may be offered as an apology for the prosecution, to judge of the weight it ought to have.

I think

I think the fairest course I can take, and that which will be the least disrespectful to the learned Judge, will be to endeavour to collect and arrange the evidence, and to place it in such points of view, as may serve to assist those who read the trial, to understand the true import of it. When this is understood, every man may judge for himself, whether it was seen in its true light by the learned Judge, and whether they can go along with him in his way of applying it to the charge. I will not presume to oppose myself personally to the learned Judge; I will assert nothing; I will not say that the learned Judge mistook the case from the beginning to the end; that many very material parts of it escaped his notice altogether; that many facts were assumed by the learned Judge as proved, which rested upon evidence so contradictory, that, in order to come at the fact, it was absolutely necessary to weigh the credit of the respective witnesses, and the comparative probabilities of their respective evidence; and to decide which of three different stories was to be believed. I will not assert, that when the learned Judge assumed the province of the Jury, he found his verdict palpably against the weight of the evidence; I only desire that the evidence may be read and considered, and will leave it to those who will read and consider it, to draw their own conclusions.

In



In discoursing upon this subject, I shall proceed in the method, I have been used to propose first, to state the substance of that part of the evidence which had no contrariety in it. I shall consider the facts to which that part of the evidence applies, as proved, and I shall state what I conceive to be, the result of those facts with reference to the charge in this indictment: I shall then, state the evidence in which there is a contrariety—the different representations of those facts which are differently represented by the witnesses. I shall consider which of those representations is supported by the weight of the evidence; and when the fact is, by this process, sufficiently ascertained, I shall, as in the former part of the case, consider how it will apply to the charge, and then, as we saw, I shall conclude with some practical inferences from the whole.

First, then, the evidence distinctly proves that Mr. Grindley acted as the Deputy Registrar, under the direction of the Bishop, without any appointment from the principal Registrar. I shall not stay to enquire whether, in the language of the indictment, he was duly appointed. That is a matter of law, and much out of my reach. But if he was duly appointed, it must have been by the Bishop, for certainly he had no appointment from any one else; and it appears by the evidence, that the

maining

c

Principal

Principal Registrar left every thing belonging to the execution of the office entirely to the Bishop. Mr. Grindley had been the Bishop's agent; the Bishop had removed him from his agency. In the trial there is an allusion to the *cause* of his removal. The Judge interposed (I dare say very properly)—they were not then to enter into Mr. Grindley's private affairs! The Bishop withdrew from the office his seal, which, by the way, ought, as I conceive, to be in the custody of the Chancellor of the diocese, or of his Surrogate, and ought never to have been in the custody of the Registrar.

It is not distinctly proved, but may be collected from the evidence, that the Bishop had likewise called upon Mr. Grindley to give up his situation of Deputy Registrar. It must have been a very disagreeable thing to him to have a man about him in the responsible situation of Registrar, who had not his confidence. Mr. Grindley felt the propriety of his giving it up, and only put off the day. Probably the Bishop thought that Mr. Grindley was trifling with him; and the event, as stated by Mr. Adam, Mr. Grindley's counsel, has proved that he was trifling with him, for he pretends to keep the office to this hour. The Bishop seems to have made up his mind, that Mr. Grindley ought to quit the office immediately upon his re-  
quisition.



quisition. He demanded the key, which was refused to him. He ordered the door to be opened, and a new lock to be put upon it, which was done without personal violence to any one. Mr. Grindley, being informed of this, armed himself with fire-arms, got together his two clerks, two servants armed with sticks, and a blacksmith, whom he was also pleased to call his servant, armed with some of the implements of his calling, and broke open the outer door of the office also without personal violence to any one, but then Jones, the Bishop's agent, interposing, putting his back to the inner door, and endeavouring to prevent Mr. Grindley forcing his way into the office, Mr. Grindley confesses that he *assaulted* him, and removed him *by force and personal violence*. His cries alarmed the Bishop's servants; Raabrook came forward; Mr. Grindley presented his pistol, and threatened to shoot him;—he retired. Mr. Grindley finished his work, forced his way into the inner room, and the outer door was then closed from within. After some time the Bishop knocked at the door, and demanded to be admitted; Mr. Grindley said, he would shoot any man who should force the door. The Bishop said, "Will you shoot the Bishop?" and again demanded to be admitted; Mr. Grindley opened the door, and the Bishop entered. It was market-day, though one

of the witnesses represented it otherwise, and several people had collected round the door.

Thus far the fact is plain. Let us make a pause here, and take a survey of this part of the evidence, and see to what it results.

Leaving the question to be decided hereafter in the proper jurisdiction, whether Mr. Grindley was, in strict law, any thing more than a servant under the Bishop, whom he might dismiss at his pleasure; I think it most manifest that the Bishop considered him as his servant, put into the office by himself, who had the management of the concerns of the office for his relation the Registrar, a minor; and that in truth he was himself responsible, both to his relation and to the public, for the office being properly taken care of by the person whom he should think fit, from time to time, to place in it, — that he had a right to remove Mr. Grindley at his pleasure, from a situation which Mr. Grindley held, as he conceived, only during his pleasure; that having appointed the deputy Registrar as he had appointed his agent, he concluded that he might dismiss his deputy Registrar as he had dismissed his agent; and that when he ordered the office to be opened, and a new lock to be put on the door, he did not mean to act arbitrarily, but did just what he would have done if his butler had taken



taken away the key of his plate-chest, and had refused to deliver it to him.

On the other hand, Mr. Grindley might, by possibility, entertain a conceit that the Bishop had no right so to remove him; (strange as it seems to a man unlearned in the law, that it should be made a question, whether the man who appoints may not remove a mere servant) or by possibility, Mr. Grindley might have been advised by his new friends, whom, between the 4th and the 8th, he had had a convenient opportunity of consulting, to try to make something out of this circumstance of the Bishop ordering the door to be opened, which, if the Bishop had no right to remove Mr. Grindley at his pleasure, might amount in law to a trespass. It is not for me to say whether it could, or it could not, be considered as a trespass; but I may say, that the transactions of the 4th were not the transactions of the 8th; and that the force made use of on the 4th, to get possession of the office, ought not to be confounded with the force supposed to have been employed on the 8th, to dispossess Mr. Grindley.

I proceed to observe, that when Mr. Grindley took upon himself to possess himself of the office by force, and with personal violence offered both

to

to Jones and Rasbrook, threatening the life of the latter, apparently he committed a very great breach of the peace, in which were many of the ingredients of that tumult and riot with which he afterwards thought fit to charge the Bishop. Whether, supposing Mr. Grindley had happened to be indicted, he could have justified what he did, would, as I am informed, depend on two questions, and, I believe, he would have had very up-hill work in both of them. The first question would be, whether he had any right to the possession; and the second, whether he asserted his right in a lawful manner? Another, and perhaps a more efficacious mode of defence, and which Mr. Grindley was advised to adopt (a defence by anticipation) was to indict the Bishop.

Here I will leave Mr. Grindley for the present, and return to the Bishop.

It will be remembered, that the Bishop did not approach the place till after one of his servants had been insulted and beaten, and the life of his other servant Rasbrook threatened, by a man who had forced his way into the office with arms in his hands, and was there surrounded by people, some of them of the very lowest condition, and very unfit to be left in the repository of the records and archives of this diocese.

It



It does not appear what representation had been made to the Bishop of that which was passing in the office; but it is fair to suppose, that all which had passed had been communicated to him, perhaps with the aggravations which usually accompany the communication of extraordinary events by ordinary relators.

Now I ask, and I put it to every serious reader of the trial to collect from the circumstances, for what purpose did the Bishop come there? Can it be imagined that he came there with an intent to dispossess Mr. Grindley by force and violence? I am ready to concede, that he was strongly prepossessed with an opinion that Mr. Grindley had no right to be there, having been dismissed by him; that Mr. Grindley's forcing his way into the office must have appeared to him to be a very outrageous proceeding of a discarded servant; that he felt himself affronted and insulted, and that he was extremely angry; still I ask, for what purpose did the Bishop come there? I will answer this question by putting another: For what purpose ought a man in his high station, a preacher of peace on earth, and good-will towards men; a man whom every consideration would urge to interpose for the preservation of good order, and whom nothing ought to provoke to mix in personal contests of any kind; for what purpose ought such a man to have

have interposed? Shall it not be presumed in favour of such a man, until a cloud of witnesses force upon us a different impression, that he did interpose to put a stop to a tumult which might have endangered the safety of the office, and the lives of the people assembled.

The presence, and the personal interposition of great magistrates, and of grave men in high stations, have at all times been considered as useful, and even necessary, on every appearance of tumult and riot; and they generally produce the happiest effects: the very appearance of the Roman Senator, sitting in his curule chair, and adorned with all the ensigns of his dignities, almost disarmed the ferocious, blood-thirsty Gaul: "You will not shoot your Bishop," were the first words addressed to this riotous man, who had created all this confusion.

Other considerations might very probably mix themselves with this primary object—the putting an end to the tumult which Grindley had raised: probably the Bishop thought, that by shewing himself there, and publicly disavowing Grindley as his officer, he should induce Grindley to desist from further asserting, what the Bishop surely must be allowed to have considered as a most unwarrantable claim—the claim to be in possession of this office

against



against his will. The Bishop might have persuaded  
himself, that on a requisition made to him in a de-  
termined tone and manner, Mr. Grindley and his  
myrmidons would have the decency to abandon  
their plan of keeping possession of the office by  
force, and would retire, and that, by their means,  
peace might be restored. To suppose that Mr. Grindley  
and his myrmidons would have the decency to retire,  
and that the Bishop, unarmed, assisted by three  
Clergymen unarmed, and attended by his agents  
Jones unarmed, would by force and violence be  
removed and expelled from the office?—  
a point which he must have thought strange; those  
who had been reported to him of his behaviour,  
a man who he knew was armed with a deadly  
weapon, and was supported by a lot of ruffians;  
unarmed, and I say? Oh! but the Bishop then  
went out on his coat of mail, and was armed  
to the very teeth; he sent for a Justice of the Peace,  
and a Constable. ~~These two men~~ and  
—on this being done, and the Bishop  
proceed to the consideration of the subsequent  
part of the evidence. (Grindley), as he described  
himself, and his myrmidons, and his myrmidons,  
and the facts will be to be collected from the  
evidence of three or four witnesses, who, being  
examined separately, in parts of their evidence  
contradict one another so materially, that a con-  
scientious Jury would hardly give credit, with en-  
durance

the satisfaction to their own minds, the contents  
of their testimony. *him* mentioned that on a reputation made  
and his yellow AM. remained long and manner. Mr. Grindley and his  
The witnesses all agree in the story that for  
that the Bishop entered the office in a great rage,  
and with his fists clinched, which Mr. Grindley  
might be a posture of offence, but they differ  
widely, as to what he said and did. Mr. Grindley,  
as might be expected, makes the strongest charge  
against the Bishop. He represents the Bishop as  
coming up to him in a great rage, and saying  
"I am sure I will not let you stay here - I will turn  
you out immediately." He says he answered, "My  
Lord, I shall certainly behave with due respect to  
your Lordship, but I will not leave the office."  
He says the Bishop took hold of him, that he  
was from him to his husband's (William Robert  
bert), and then went and laid hold of David Robert  
bert, brother of his husband, and attempted to pull  
him out of the office: that returned to William Robert  
bert, took him by the collar, and pushed him to-  
wards the door; that the Bishop came up to him  
(Grindley), as he described it, with his hands  
clinched, holding them up before his breast, and said  
he would turn him out, and that he called to his  
servants and said, come and take them out.

Pitcher's account is, that the Bishop seemed  
to be in a very violent passion, that he followed  
Grindley



Grindley said, "fine work, fine work!"  
 Grindley said, "so it is, my Lord, breaking open  
 my office in this manner. As the Bishop said  
 the Bishop, "you have no right to be here—  
 you must quit it immediately," or words to that  
 effect. Grindley said, he had a right to be there.  
 The Bishop said, the Bishop went towards Grin-  
 dley very often, as if he had a mind, as it were,  
 to take him by the collar. He said, the Bishop ordered his  
 people to turn Roberts out, and desired that he  
 would not stay. He ran at his collar and  
 grappled

Grindley to him, and would to pull him down  
 the door. He said he did not know Grindley, and  
 to say what person said. The witness on his part  
 was Grindley, who I am sure of. The witness  
 in the middle of his own statement, how the  
 Bishop moved his hands? He testified in his  
 hand down by his side, and he mentioned a  
 circumstance not noticed by Grindley, that while  
 the Bishop was in the office, Grindley moved him  
 with a wife, and that the Bishop said he would  
 deliver it. The witness then said his wife gave  
 him the book, and that he would not give it.

Upon comparing the evidence, Grindley said  
 alone in representing the Bishop to have laid hold  
 of him. Thomas went then far, that the Bishop  
 went towards Grindley, as if he had a mind (as  
 the witness thought) to collar him. Peitchard  
 saw nothing that approached towards it. It is  
 observable how this is worked up. That which  
 Thomas chose to fancy the Bishop had a mind to  
 do, Mr. Grindley had no difficulty in proving  
 what he did do.

Grindley mentioned the Bishop with his arms  
 clinched, and his arms raised on his head, the  
 other say, the arms were hanging down by his  
 sides. Grindley says, the Bishop laid hold of Ro-  
 bert Davis, the other two witnesses saw no such  
 thing, and the three witnesses gave three different  
 accounts



Interrogated by the jury, they say, that the Bishop told to  
 William Roberts, the rustic blacksmith, who was  
 nobody would give any account, what it was  
 about who these fellows were? Grindley says, the  
 Bishop took him by the collar, and pushed him  
 towards the door; Thomas says, the Bishop or-  
 dered his people at both Roberts etc; told Robert  
 that he would make out; he fastened up the door,  
 and grappled William, and wanted to push him  
 towards the door; Prichard's narrative; that he  
 went up to Roberts, and laid hold of him, de-  
 scribing to be taking hold of his stickler, and  
 pushed him towards the door. There is such a  
 difference between taking a man by the collar, and  
 pushing the hand upon the shoulder, that all these  
 accounts cannot be true; if either of them were  
 true, surely it must have been the last, for a man  
 who, which every body, except Mr. Grindley  
 had his friends, will acknowledge the fact; and  
 because the action is described by the poets with  
 the bible and the laws of a gentleman in the  
 situation they describe the Bishop to describe  
 it, and in truth, amounts to no more than, "go,  
 my friend, you have no business here," or in the  
 French vulgar language, "vade retro," which, by the  
 way, nobody can believe were the words actually  
 used by the Bishop, (and I am sure) and should  
 rather be, "get out of here, you have no business  
 here."

of Grindley charges the Bishop with saying, "I will turn you out," and with calling to his people to turn him out, and those who were with him; for that is the effect of his evidence; but according to Pritchard, his expression was, "I insist upon your going out." Thomas's account is substantially the same as Pritchard's; he makes the Bishop say, "You must quit immediately," and both of these differ essentially from Grindley in their accounts of what the Bishop said, using any expression of this kind. Grindley represents him to have at once declared, that he would turn him out, without a word having been said on his part—*"fine work, you shall not stay here, I will turn you out immediately!"* and it is not by inadvertence that he so states it. It is so marked that he came there with that intention, and for that purpose. But the account given by the two other witnesses is, that what the Bishop said was in reply to something which had fallen from Grindley. When the Bishop had, certainly with great emphasis, characterized this riotous proceeding of Grindley's by the expression, *"fine work, fine work!"* Grindley insolently retorted, *"yes, fine work is breaking open my office,"* and it was the Bishop said, *"you shall not stay here—no business here—I insist upon your going out immediately,"* according to one of the witnesses; *"your office? You have no right to be here—*  
*you*





their (qualifying) Bishop's own. This story left  
 Pritchard and Thomas speak much, is a mistaken  
 turn given to the evidence; for they both agree  
 in representing the Bishop as having called upon both  
 the two witnesses, as they were discharged. I shall  
 particularly observe that Robert, the Bishop's own  
 counsel did, and did Grindley, who said, "I shall not say  
 I shall not say that you shall not say that you shall not say  
 Grindley is a great lawyer having made his  
 change, it was necessary to prove as above called  
 for violence offered by the Bishop to himself, and  
 compassing with a declared object that the Bishop  
 would himself say his own intention was that  
 would go a great way towards forcing the Bishop  
 in the charge of causing in the office with intent  
 to remove Grindley by force, and with  
 having procured to execute that intent, and effect  
 having committed a breach of the peace in the  
 execution of it. Grindley says to this effect:  
 and to this declaration. His witness was only  
 did not support him, but gave such an account  
 that of the circumstances upon which Grindley  
 relied, that they do in effect contradict him in  
 every particular, and left in doubt open and undetermined  
 what the Bishop would do next. If Grindley did  
 I ask then, did the Bishop call Grindley?  
 Did he lay hold of him? Did he come up to him  
 with his hands stretched out to him?  
 Did he say he would take Grindley off? Did he  
 call



call his servants to turn Grindley out? I conceive, that no body could answer these questions, with reference to this cause, and as a ground for the verdict that was to be pronounced in it, but that Jury who tried this case. I conceive, that it was fit and necessary that these questions should have been put distinctly to the Jury, with such observations upon this contrariety in the evidence as occurred to the learned Judge. And here, where so much depended upon the credit of Grindley's testimony, there was room for observing who Mr. Grindley was; under what circumstances he appeared as the prosecutor of an indictment against the Bishop of Bangor, his master and his friend, while he deserved to have such a friend. The Jury, judging for themselves, as it was their duty to do, have answered these questions; they have by their verdict answered every one of them in the negative. Mr. Grindley cannot complain, if they have believed his witnesses; the world will not complain, if they have rejected the whole testimony as a heap of trash, a tissue of absurdities. In either case they will have decided upon the fact honestly, according to the weight of the evidence.

Taking the case stripped of Mr. Grindley's aggravations, and as his witnesses have represented it, O God! what is it which has produced a charge

charge of a riot against a Bishop of the Church of England? The Bishop hearing that Grindley had broke into the office by force, and with personal violence to one of his servants—that he was armed with a deadly weapon, and had threatened the life of another of his servants, and that he had a gang of ruffians with him in the office, apprehensive of a tumult and danger to the records, and also to the lives of the people assembled, went hastily and in great emotion, feeling himself personally insulted, to the place, and there demanded of Grindley that he should go out of the office. He sent for a Justice of the Peace and a Constable (a circumstance which seems to have escaped the learned Judge altogether) and seeing two people in the office, who could have no business there, two ruffian-looking men, ordered them to be turned out, and himself gave one of them a push towards the door, and at length, finding that Grindley peremptorily refused to quit the office, and that he could not be removed without violence, he himself withdrew, persuaded (if Mr. Grindley pleases) by the ladies of his family, leaving Grindley in possession.

Against Mr. Grindley this might have been made something of. There was on his part a forcible entry, and perhaps, some colour for charging him and his gang with a riot. But to turn  
the



the tables on the Bishop, and to make him the rioter, seems to be a most marvellous perversion of things, dextrously enough conducted, for it has deceived the very elect, but surely marked by no vulgar profligacy.

The poor Archdeacon, too, for as to all the other defendants, I take leave to observe, that there is not a tittle of evidence against them, notwithstanding Doctor Owen, they say, both *talked and laughed*; the Archdeacon of Merioneth is involved in this riot—"Why, what evil hath he done?" They say, he threatened to turn them all out: He said he would turn out Grindley himself, if no one else would. They say he swaggered, opened his breast, bid Grindley shoot him instead of the Bishop, called out Grindley by way of challenge, as the witness conjectured. If this part of the case were worthy of a minute discussion, the evidence, as to these particulars, is open to much observation, but I shall not stay to break a fly upon a wheel; probably enough, my countryman's blood might be fired at the indignity offered to his Superior, to whom he looked up with reverence and the most dutiful attachment. They say he bared his breast to receive the shot which might have been aimed at the Bishop. Did he? honest, generous creature, I honour him for it—this, like charity, might cover a multitude of sins. If he did actually

threaten, it was but a threat—a swagger, as the witness contemptuously termed it. If in the heat of his zeal he even challenged Grindley, surely this was but personal intemperance, for which in his own person he would be to answer. I do not perceive in the evidence, that the Bishop undertook to be his second. In short, the whole of this evidence is too ridiculous to be made the ground of a *joint* charge of any offence whatever; and it is as like an ounce or a camel, as it is like a riot in the worthy Archdeacon.

Did not then the Jury do right in pronouncing the verdict which they did pronounce, and if any man thought that they ought to have given a different verdict, was he not egregiously mistaken; and what apology can his mistake furnish for the malice of a diabolical plan to ruin the character, and destroy the peace and happiness of any man, were he the meanest individual in the county of Caernarvon, for the sake of their election.

I ought not to close this examination of the evidence, without doing all I can to prevent my conclusions being pressed beyond their proper bearing. I lament sincerely, that there was a necessity for making any mention of the learned Judge who tried this cause; but I rely on the candor and generosity of his mind. If it is discovered that there



is solid ground to impute error to his summing up, I am confident he will rejoice that this method hath been taken to provide a remedy for the wrong which that error hath produced. I impute nothing to the learned Judge but error in judgment, from which the best and wisest are not exempt. I solemnly declare that I do not mean to insinuate any reproach of partiality, — thank God! the integrity of our Judges is above all suspicion. I go further; I verily believe, that if the learned Judge could have intentionally yielded to any bias, it must have been on the side of the Bishop. I apprehend that his principles and his connexions lean that way. I have no doubt but that he was determined to resist all those general impressions which he could foresee might tend to mislead his judgment; but in throwing his mind into the opposite scale, has he not been acted upon, without perceiving it, by a strong bias the other way? I have often heard it said, I would rather have my judge my enemy than my friend. Does not this case furnish some evidence of the truth of the adage.

In a case of less magnitude, where a Judge had felt himself more at his ease, I think it must have occurred to him to examine the outline of it, and to weigh the probabilities on one side and on the other.

Bishops

Bishops being but men, have the frailties of men; but surely it was improbable, that a man of the Bishop of Bangor's age, of his profession, and of his rank in his profession, should have left his house with an intention personally to engage in a Welsh brawl;—or that he would have been present, or would have taken any part; but for the express purpose of restoring peace and good order; to me it appears so grossly improbable, that the contrary ought to have been presumed;—and that the evidence which was offered to repel that presumption, and to establish a fact almost incredible, should at least have been scanned with a jealous eye. No wonder the minds of the Jury revolted at every conclusion the learned Judge drew from such evidence. Had the learned Judge but traced in his own mind the outline of the tale which was to fix this grievous imputation upon the Bishop, he must have perceived the wickedness of the attempt. What had Mr. Grindley to complain of? The Bishop being refused access to the Registrar's office, ordered the door to be opened, and a new lock to be put upon it. Mr. Grindley armed himself, and redressed himself. His violence alarmed the people—he presented his loaded pistol, threatening to shoot any man who should molest him. The people retired—Mr. Grindley remained in possession, and has been in possession ever since. What personal, what pecuniary injury has he suffered?



ferred? Has he not been a great gainer? If he has lost the confidence of the Bishop of Bangor, in return he gained that of other *great and far more magnificent personages*! The Earl of Uxbridge has been exceedingly kind to him ever since, and, I am told, has even condescended to permit him to have a corner in his Lordship's carriage, when his affairs called him to London, a very short time before this famous cause was to be tried at Shrewsbury. Of what does Mr. Grindley complain? Of that for which, had he brought his action, one *penny* damages had probably been deemed too ample a satisfaction. Why has he preferred his complaint in the form of an indictment? The answer is ready. Because in that form it will best serve the purposes of the election for the county of Caernarvon.

If the case had presented itself to the learned Judge in this point of view, I am persuaded that he would have given no countenance to this prosecution; he would not have suffered a court of justice, in which he presided, to have been an instrument in the hands of Mr. Grindley, or of his employers;—he would have felt as, happily for the cause of truth and justice, the Jury did feel.

If those who are at the bottom of these prosecutions had thought fit to have submitted to the verdict of the Jury, and had not continued to libel the

the Bishop in every newspaper which would receive their (condemning) paragraphs; if a vile calumniator had not been hired to disseminate this poison throughout the kingdom, it is very possible that the outrage, of which they have been guilty, might never have been made the subject of discussion. The Bishop himself has not thought fit to make any appeal to the public; he appears to have imposed himself in a conscience void of offence, and in the protection of the law. Indignation has now urged a man wholly unknown to the Bishop to enter the lists. Disappointed, yet not unrelenting malice, should find refuge no where; all honest men have a common interest in exposing it to the broad day-light. Let these malignant persecutors of the Bishop, therefore, no longer shelter themselves under the venerable name and authority of the learned Judge who tried this cause; let them retire covered with shame and confusion; and, above all, let them no longer find credit with better men than themselves, who have been drawn in, and prevailed upon to go lengths which, in their cooler moments, it is impossible they should approve of. Let stout men have the generosity to concede to the Bishop (and the higher their rank the more generous, and the more honourable to themselves will be the concession) that in their zeal for the success of an design they have gone too far. The Bishop is not the man I take him to be,



be, if he is not ready to meet them, mean that  
 half-must distrust that he is a Christian Bishop,  
 and though not a phlegmatic man, that he has not  
 authority to his temper, that his passion gets sub-  
 dued, and that he is in danger of all reason in  
 the frame of mind, and he long remains to per-  
 sists in the See of Bangor, in the pursuit of the  
 interests of religion and virtue, the hospitable  
 and munificent dispenser of the revenues of the  
 church within his diocese, the patron of indigent  
 merit, and the poor man's friend.

My honest countrymen, I trust will take off  
 unworthy judgments, and the slaves of no man,  
 because he happens to be a Bishop, but think for them-  
 selves, they will then do justice to the exalted  
 character of their Bishop, and again attach them-  
 selves with duty and reverence to their Pastor,  
 a Pastor indeed, for he has always for his flock.  
 Concerning he must submit to have one man,  
 has injured him too deeply ever to forgive him.  
 It will be some consolation to the Bishop, to re-  
 flect that he is beyond the reach of that man's en-  
 mity, and that his friendship might save him. I ap-  
 peal to both the noble Lords! For the sake of the  
 diocese, I earnestly hope that the Bishop will not  
 be tempted to change his situation. The diocese  
 of Bangor is a situation worthy of the active mind,  
 and the talents for business of the present Bishop.

His long and regular residence has been a public benefit to the country. His clergy are improved in learning, in manners, and in their habits of life, by seeing him living amongst them, and by having experienced that to be a good parish priest is a task to his fellow. Beyond the exemplary discharge of his spiritual functions, by his judicious liberality, he has created, and kept alive, a spirit of industry in the people who live within the circle of his connexions in the country. Idleness, and its attendant poverty, are in a great degree banished from his neighbourhood. Let any man look at the count of Bangor in its present state, and compare it with its former condition; let him enquire into the state of the diocese; then let him lay his hand upon his breast, and say, whether the Bishop of Bangor should have been affronted, reviled, insulted, persecuted, and, if possible, driven out of the country, because his character and influence were likely to bring into hazard the election of Sir Robert Williams for the county of Caernarvon.

I have been asked, why do Bishops interfere at all in elections? It hath been said, if the Bishop of Bangor had not interfered in the election for the county of Caernarvon, he had escaped this satire; and this, I must confess, is not an unfair statement of the merits both of the anonymous pamphlet, and

of



of Mr. Grindley's professions. I presume neither Lord Viscount Bunsley, nor the Earl of Uxbridge, will ask, why do Bishops interfere at all in elections? I presume, that it is as objectionable with either of these Lords of Parliament, that a Lord of Parliament interferes in an election. Probably their objection is not that the Bishop of Bangor interfered at all in the election for the county of Caernarvon, but that he did not interfere on the right side. I have heard that one of the noble Lords did repeatedly, and most anxiously, solicit the Bishop's interference in this election. The other noble Lord, I have also heard, did consent to ask his interference, and so accept it very graciously, in a former election for another county within the Bishop's diocese; and I believe, though it is a circumstance which, I conclude, has escaped the memory of that noble Lord, that he owed the election of his friend in that instance entirely to the Bishop's influence. To these noble Lords, therefore, no explanation is due: but there are those, whose opinions I respect, to whom I will address a short answer to the question—Why do Bishops interfere at all in elections?

That this issue between Bishops and the public may be fairly tried, I desire that, when we are talking of Bishops interfering in elections, we may distinctly





opinion, friendship, gratitude, (nay, even dependence; should influence his choice.

Can it then be a crime in a Bishop, if his clergy look up to him, if, when they are called upon to vote at an election, they wish to give their votes in a manner which their Bishop will approve of, if they eagerly embrace such an opportunity of demonstrating their respect and attachment to their Bishop? Can considerations more proper to influence free and independent men, more honourable to themselves and to their Bishop, be stated? or shall it be said that a clergyman should, in order to preserve his independence, prefer to be influenced by the importunity of a drunken canvasser.

Doubtless, a Bishop may renounce having any opinion upon the subject of an election, and his clergy may exercise their franchise upon motives which do not spring out of their relation to their Bishop; but will religion, morals, or the true spirit of our excellent constitution, derive any security from this separation of the clergy from their Bishop? I admit that if, unfortunately for any diocese, there was a Bishop who never opened his doors to his clergy, and who disposed of all his parochial preferments on the application of Lord A. and Lord B. in order to strengthen their borough or county interest, he might as well re-

nounce

nounce having any opinion upon the subject of an election, for he would have no influence: but let him be what a Bishop ought to be—exemplary in the discharge of his public and his Christian duties—hospitable and generous—friendly in his intercourse with his clergy—himself their patron, he will have influence, and he cannot divest himself of his influence, without divesting himself of his situation, and of those qualities of the head and the heart which originally created it: His clergy are not stocks or stones, they cannot be brutally insensible of his claims upon them for such testimonies of affection and regard as their limited means enable them to offer him. From such pure sources a Bishop may most honourably, and I presume to think, constitutionally, and without departing from the chastity and sanctity of his public character derive an influence, the effect of which is so innocent, that it might have prevailed in *Utopia* as well as in *farre Rowall*.

By way of illustration, let us advert to what is passing at this moment in another Welch county. The son of a Lord of Parliament, that Lord not only learned, but also reverend, is one of the candidates. I beg to ask, would it have been a crime in that reverend and learned Lord, who, in my opinion, has a character to sustain full as sound as that of a Bishop, to have interfered in that



that election, assuring that he could do nothing unworthy of himself in the manner of using, or suffering to be used, the influence which his immense property, his eminent situation in his profession, and his many private virtues, have created? The noble and learned Lord would undoubtedly avoid the appearance of interfering personally in this election; but while the Lord still continues to be a candidate, what will this propriety of conduct amount to? *It amounts to nothing.*

By withdrawing himself from all personal interference, he does not, and indeed cannot, divest himself of his influence, or retire his influence of his ability and energy. His Lordship would hardly, I presume, be understood to renounce the most active support of all those elections over whom he had an influence—Does he not expect in 1790 or 1791 to give a young man, just of age, who will, I am confident, be a most ornament to his rank, but who has not yet finished his education, and, as perhaps, perhaps, his house as the son of the noble and learned Lord, offer himself to the country? The people of England have a right to expect this support. Ought their expectations to be disappointed? Would it not outrage our feelings if they were to be disappointed? In experience, are not these expectations equivalent to commands? Will not the friends  
of





If the proposition is acceded to in the particular case of a son, I ask, will it make any difference if the candidate happened to be a relation in a more remote degree; or, if he was no relation, but some dear and honoured friend? Who is there that has so cold a heart as not to admit the claims of a friend to be often as irresistible as those of our nearest family connexions.

The laity will probably agree with me that they may interfere in elections; but they will tell us that Bishops are spiritual men—that they ought to confine themselves to the exercise of their spiritual functions, to be retired, abstracted, and wholly withdrawn from the business and politics of the world—that they ought not to intermeddle in elections, though the laity will for themselves claim that privilege in its utmost extent: But I will take the liberty to insist, that there is no distinction in this respect between clergy and laity; that such a distinction is against the spirit of our municipal laws, and the constitution of our government, as well as contrary to the nature of things. Our clergy are no longer an insulated body separated from the society in which they live, confined to their Convocation, and having no participation in the rights of free subjects at large, particularly in that noble franchise—the right of electing members to serve in  
 o Parliament.

Parliament. They have temporal as well as spiritual duties: Bishops have them in an eminent degree. By virtue of their office they are a part of the great council of the nation, and assist to conduct the business of it. How large a part, and with what advantage to the community, the Bishop of Bangor hath taken, has been felt and gratefully acknowledged by those who, for the last sixteen years, have had occasion to transact business in Parliament.

I have succeeded very ill indeed, if I have not proved that, in the nature of things, Bishops must have influence; and were I not myself a member (though one of the lowest, and least worthy) of that order to which they belong, I would boldly challenge for them even a better right to use their influence in elections than the laity have, because that influence is generally derived from purer sources.

A Bishop cannot, in order to strengthen his influence, keep his term (my North Wales friends will know what I mean), he cannot drink and smoke with the voters, or dance with their wives and daughters; he is not very likely to spend a hundred thousand pounds to carry an election: He must be a good Bishop to be of any consequence with the electors. If the Bishop of  
Bangor



131

Bishop had been oppressive and tyrannical, selfish, avaricious and uncharitable, the indignity of the persecution of this venerable Prelate would not have given themselves the trouble of complaining that he had intermeddled in the election for the County of Caernarvon.

P. S. Since the pamphlet, of which these considerations are the substance, was written, I learn that the Bishop of Bangor has visited his diocese, and that he has been received there with every demonstration of respect and affection; that the whole diocese—persons of all ranks and conditions, including some of those who are supposed to have taken a part in the violent proceedings against the Bishop, have expressed their disapprobation of those proceedings, and their satisfaction at the event. What a triumph over malice and duplicity! This has crowned my wishes. My countrymen have acted as became them. The Bishop, I doubt not, will also take the part which it becomes him to take: If he has any enemies left, he will forgive them. With the means in his hands of bringing them to condign punishment, he will leave them to their own feelings. If they have any pretensions to the character of gentlemen, and men of honour, they will suffer severely, and his forgiveness will but aggravate those sufferings, until they redeem themselves by

some

London, Oct. 18, 1896.

RECEIVED

This electron micrograph shows a single mitochondrion from a normal rat liver. The organelle is roughly oval-shaped with a thick, dark outer membrane and a highly folded inner membrane forming cristae. The internal matrix is electron-dense and contains various small granules and fibers.